



Attorney Docket No.: 2000-1220-RA7
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No.: 10/619,762)
)
Filed: 07/15/2003) Examiner: Nguyen, T.
)
Inventor: KACHNIC, Edward) Art Unit: 1722
)
For: SENSORY INSPECTION SYSTEM AND)
METHOD THEREOF)
)

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED 09/21/2005

Mail Stop: Response
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Arlington, VA 22313-1450

Myers & Kaplan,
Intellectual Property Law, L.L.C.
1899 Powers Ferry Road
Suite 310
Atlanta, GA 30339

January 23, 2006

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, in the above-styled patent application, please note election as indicated with traverse, amend the application as indicated and consider the appended remarks. Please find enclosed Amendments to the Claims, including a Status of All Claims, a petition for three-month extension of time, and a check for all fees.

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence, along with any papers referred to therein as being attached or enclosed therewith, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail, No. EV696944345 02, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450 on:

1-23-2006

(Date)

Teri L. Bonica

Name of the person mailing the paper or fee

Teri L. Bonica

(Signature of the person mailing)

RESTRICTION ELECTION

Pursuant to Examiner's restriction requirement, Applicant elects Species I: "drawn to an image-processing device, classified in class 700, subclass 197."

Applicant respectfully notes that Examiner referenced Species I as encompassing Claims 1-8, 23-28, Species II as encompassing Claims 9-19, and Species III as encompassing Claims 20-22, but Examiner did not reference Claims 29 and 30.

However, Applicant further notes that Species II is described as "drawn to a molding machine," but Claims 9 and 10, referenced by Examiner within Species II, claim "an image-processing device," as specified for Species I.

Additionally, Species III is described as "drawn to a method for inspecting the presence of a forming part during the forming process," but Claims 20-22, referenced by Examiner within Species III, claim "a part-forming machine," as specified for Species II.

Therefore, Applicant believes a Claim numbering error exists in the restriction requirement Action, and respectfully submits Applicant's response with the understanding that Examiner intended, based upon Examiner's description of the content of each class, that

Species I include Claims 1-10, 27-30, that Species II include Claims 11-23, and that Species III include Claims 24-26.

Thus, Applicant elects Species I, with the understanding that Species I includes Claims 1-10, 27-30.